

### **Remarks**

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 13, 17-19, 21, 22, 25, and 26 were pending when last examined, all of which stand rejected. Claims 1, 4, 21, 25, and 26 are amended.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 25 and 26 are objected to for being indefinite. Both claims are amended.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

Claims 1, 8, 21, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Application Publication No. 2003/0214621 to Kim et al. (“Kim”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,839,099 to Fukunishi (“Fukunishi”) and U.S. Application Publication No. 2005/0099577 to Lee et al (“Lee”).

Claims 1, 8, and 21 are patentable over a combination of Kim, Fukunishi, and Lee because Lee is not a proper prior art reference against the Application. The Application claims priority to two Korean patent applications: Korean Patent Application No. 2003-19597 filed on March 28, 2003 and Korean Patent Application No. 2003-20598 filed on April 1, 2003. Lee was filed in the U.S. on August 20, 2003, which is after the priority dates of the Application. Translations of the certified copies of the two Korean patent applications from which this Application claims priority are enclosed along with declarations by a Korean patent attorney attesting to the accuracy of the translations. These documents perfect the priority claim made under 35 USC 119(a), invalidating Lee as a proper prior art against the above claims.

Without Lee, Kim and Fukunishi do not teach all the elements of Claims 1, 8, and 21. Therefore, claims 1, 8, and 21 are patentable over Kim and Fukunishi. For example, Kim and Fukunishi, even in combination, do not teach that “a distance between neighboring spacers decreases as the spacers approach a center of the display region ....”

Claims 25 and 26 depend from Claims 1 and 8 and are patentable over Kim and Fukunishi for the same reasons as Claims 1 and 8.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 13, 17-19, and 22 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, Fukunishi and Lee as applied to Claims 1, 8, 21, and 25-26 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,932 to Zhang et al. (“Zhang”).

Claims 2, 4, 6, and 7 depend from Claim 1, and Claims 9, 13, and 17 depend from Claim 8. As explained above, Lee is not a proper reference against this Application. Thus, Claims 1 and 8 are patentable over Kim, Fukunishi, and Zhang, for example because they do not recite that “a distance between neighboring spacers decreases as the spacers approach a center of the display region ....” Thus, Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 13, and 17 are patentable over Kim, Fukunishi, and Zhang.

Claims 19 and 22 depend from Claim 18. Claim 18 is patentable over Kim, Fukunishi, and Zhang at least because it recites that “a distance between neighboring spacers decreases as the spacers approach a center of the display region ....” Thus, Claims 18, 19, and 22 are patentable.

Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, Fukunishi, Lee, and Zhang further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,806, 934 to Furuhashi et al. (“Furuhashi”).

Claims 5 and 10 depend from Claims 1 and 8, respectively, and these rejections are made under the assumption that Claims 1 and 8 are unpatentable over a combination of Kim, Fukunishi, Lee, and Zhang. However, Lee is not a proper reference for the reasons stated above, and Kim, Fukunishi, and Zhang do not teach all the elements recited in Claims 1 and 8. Thus, Claims 1 and 8 are patentable over Kim, Fukunishi, and Zhang and Claims 5 and 10 are patentable over a combination of Kim, Fukunishi, Lee, Zhang, and Furuhashi for at least the same reason.

For the reasons stated above, Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 13, 17-19, 21, 22, 25, and 26 are now in condition for allowance. Please telephone the undersigned attorney at (408) 392-9250 if there are any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

**MACPHERSON KWOK CHEN & HEID LLP**

Dated: April 12, 2007

By *J. M. Chen* Reg. No. 43,779  
for Kieun “Jenny” Sung  
Attorney for Assignee  
Reg. No. 48,639